Natural Resources Conservation Service

Application Ranking Summary

SI - Russian Olive/Salt Cedar Control

Program:	Ranking Date:	Application Number:
Ranking Tool: SI - Russian Olive/Salt Cedar Control		Applicant:
Final Ranking Score:		Address:
Planner:		Telephone:
Farm Location:		

National Priorities Addressed

Issue Questions	
Clean and Abundant Water: Water Quality – Will the proposed project assist the producer to:	
 a. Meet regulatory requirements relating to animal feeding operations, or proactively avoid the need for regulatory measures? 	Yes O or No O
1. b. Reduce sediment, nutrients or pesticides from agricultural operations located within a field that adjoins a designated impaired water body?	Yes O or No O
1. c. Reduce sediment, nutrients or pesticides from agricultural operations located within a field that adjoins a water body?	Yes O or No O
Clean and Abundant Water: Water Conservation – Will the proposed project assist the producer to:	
2. a. Increase groundwater recharge in identified groundwater depletion areas (http://water.usgs.gov/ogw/rasa/html/TOC.html)?	Yes O or No O
2. b. Conserve water from irrigation system improvements and result in estimated water savings of at least 5% and saved water will be available for other beneficial uses?	Yes O or No O
2. c. Conserve water in an area where the applicant participates in a geographically established or watershed-wide project?	Yes O or No O
Clean Air: Treatment of Air Quality from Agricultural Sources – Will the proposed project assist the producer to:	
3. a. Meet regulatory requirements relating to air quality or proactively avoid the need for regulatory measures?	Yes O or No O
3. b. Reduce green house gases such as methane, nitrous oxide, and volatile organic compounds (VOC)?	Yes O or No O
3. c. Increase carbon sequestration?	Yes O or No O
High Quality, Productive Soils Erosion Reduction – Will the proposed project assist the producer to:	
4. a. Reduce erosion to tolerable limits (Soil "T")?	Yes O or No O
Healthy Plant and Animal Communities Wildlife Habitat Conservation – Will the proposed project assist the producer to:	
5. a. Benefit threatened and endangered, at-risk, candidate, or species of concern as identified in a State wildlife plan?	Yes O or No O
5. b. Retain wildlife and plant benefits on land exiting the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)?	Yes O or No O
High Quality, Productive Soils, Healthy Plant and Animal Communities: Special Environmental Efforts/Initiatives – Will the proposed project assist the producer to:	
6. a. Eradicate or control noxious or invasive species?	Yes O or No O
6. b. Increase, improve or establish pollinator habitat?	Yes O or No O
6. c. Properly dispose of animal carcasses?	Yes O or No O
6. d. Implement an Integrated Pest Management plan?	Yes O or No O
6. e. Implement precision agricultural methods?	Yes O or No O
Strategic Initiative – Energy Conservation and Sustainable Production Energy Conservation – Will the proposed project assist the producer to:	
7. a. Reduce energy consumption on the agricultural operation?	Yes O or No O

Business Lines – Conservation Implementation Additional Ranking Considerations - Will the proposed project result in:	
8. a. Implementation of all planned conservation practices within three years of contract obligation?	Yes O or No O
8. b. Improvement of existing conservation practices or conservation systems already in place at the time the application is accepted, or will complete an existing conservation system?	
Does the applicant meet the following conditions:	
9. a. If the applicant has an existing EQIP contract, has it been, and is it now, on schedule and in full compliance?	Yes O or No O
9. b. Did the applicant successfully complete any past contract(s) in full compliance?	Yes O or No O
9. c. Is this the applicant's first EQIP application?	Yes O or No O

State Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
GENERAL QUESTIONS: Select all that apply.	
 Could this application assist the producer meet or avoid the need for their animal feeding operations (AFO) to be regulated as a point source under the Clean Water Act and/or Montana Water Quality Act? 	
2. Does the proposed project lie in a 16-digit watershed listed on the 303(d)-list identified by NRCS through the determination tool AND does the application propose to address a water quality criteria that is listed as an impairment for the stream?	
3. Does the land offered with this application fall within the boundaries of a local group conservation effort or plan and the contracted practices will address the resource objectives of that conservation effort?	Yes O or No O
4. Does the application include the contracting of cost-shareable management practices?	Yes O or No O
5. If funded, would this be the applicant's first EQIP contract?	Yes O or No O
6. Does the application directly benefit sage grouse habitat identified by the MT Fish, Wildlife, and Parks?	
7. Does the application result in the implementation of any one of the following innovative technologies? a. Precision agriculture b. Nutritional Balancer (NutBal) c. Grazingland Spatial Analysis Tool (GSAT) d. Rangeland health monitoring e. Certified organic farming or ranching f. Precision irrigation g. Micro irrigation h. Dual nozzles i. Lepa, or Lesa pivot systems j. Pivots with panels that use automatic continuous moisture monitoring technologies k. Self cleaning fish screens l. On-farm composting m. Feed management n. Alternative Energy	
CONSERVATION PLANNING: Answer no more than one question with yes.	
8. Does the applicant use a Resource Management System (RMS) conservation plan developed/re-evaluated within the last 5 years?	Yes O or No O
9. Does the applicant use a progressive conservation plan developed/re-evaluated within the last 5 years?	Yes O or No O
PEST MANAGEMENT: Answer no more than one question with yes.	
10. Does the application include the development and implementation of an integrated pest management (IPM) plan for noxious weeds on the impacted non-cropland acres of the operation? (Herbasceous Weed Control is not eligible for cost-share on cropland.)	
11. Does the application include the development and implementation of a treatment plan for noxious weeds on the impacted non-cropland acres of the operation? (Herbaceous Weed Control is not eligible for cost-share on cropland.)	Yes O or No O
CRITICAL SPECIES: Answer no more than one question with yes.	
12. Does the application benefit critical fish, wildlife, or plant species and assist the producer meet or avoid the need to be regulated under the Endangered Species Act?	Yes O or No O
13. Does the application benefit critical fish, wildlife, or plant species identified as Species of Concern by Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks and the Montana Natural Heritage Program?	Yes O or No O
14. Does the application directly benefit fish and/or wildlife species habitat (not covered above)?	
POLLINATOR SPECIES: Answer no more than one question with yes.	
15. Does the application benefit pollinator species through the seeding of pollinator friendly seeding mixes on ½ to 5 acres of land? (Must be in accordance with Montana NRCS Biology Technical Note	Yes O or No O

Number MT-20, March, 2009.)	
16. Does the application benefit pollinator species through the seeding of pollinator friendly seeding mixes on more than 5 acres of land? (Must be in accordance with Montana NRCS Biology Technic Note Number MT-20, March, 2009.)	

Local Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
Priority - Select no more than one of the following.	
1. High/Medium - All applications where two or more contiguous landowners will be under contract for control of Russian olive and Salt cedar and/or lands to be treated are at the head of a water course, top of drainage, top of a slope, etc; where control will eliminate seed source downstream, down slope, etc.	
2. Low - All applications that do not meet criteria above but have targeted species present.	Yes O or No O
Planned Treatment - Select no more than one of the following.	
 Planned treatment includes removing all target species present (Salt cedar, Russian olive) in all riparian areas in the operating unit. 	Yes O or No O
Planned treatment includes removing all target species present (Salt cedar, Russian olive) from selected riparian areas in the operating unit.	Yes O or No O
3. Planned treatment includes removing all target species present (Salt cedar, Russian olive) from selected areas not deemed riparian areas. This is valid only when there are no riparian areas on the unit or Russian olive/Salt cedar do not occur in those riparian areas.	Yes O or No O
 Planned treatment includes removing all Salt cedar or all Russian olive in all riparian areas in the operating unit where both are present. 	Yes O or No O
5. Planned treatment includes removing all Salt cedar or all Russian olive from selected areas not deemed riparian areas. This is valid only when there are no riparian areas on the unit or Russian olive/Salt cedar do not occur in those riparian areas.	
Additional Treatments - Select all that apply.	
 Planned treament includes the control of all identified noxious weeds on contracted lands as a supplemental practice after brush management. 	Yes O or No O
Prescribed grazing on contracted riparian areas which will, at a minimum, meet those items listed under 528, section III, Riparian Area Grazing.	Yes O or No O
3. Tree/Shrub planting (391, 612) on land where Salt Cedar or Russian Olive canopy was great enough where their removal will leave large areas of bare ground or areas likely to be infested with other invasive and/or noxious weeds.	Yes O or No O
4. Herbaceous plantings (342, 512, 550, 390) on areas where trees/shrubs are not suitable, or in conjunction with tree/shrub planting, where removal of Salt Cedar and/or Russian Olive left voids where other non-desired species could occupy.	Yes O or No O

Land Use:

Resource Concerns	Practices
Ranking Score	
Efficiency:	
Local Issues:	
State Issues:	
National Issues:	
Final Ranking Score:	

This ranking report is for your information. It does not in any way guarantee funding. When funding becomes available, you will be notified if your application is selected for funding. Some changes to the application may be required before a final contract is awarded.

Notes:

· ·	Application Signature Not Required for Contract Development unless required by State policy:
Signature Date:	Signature Date: